

<sup>8</sup>  
~~63~~ The method of claim <sup>7</sup>~~62~~ wherein areas bared of photoresist upon treatment with the developer are etched.

B3  
cont <sup>9</sup>  
~~64~~ The method of claim <sup>7</sup>~~62~~ wherein areas bared of photoresist upon treatment with the developer are exposed to a plasma gas.

<sup>10</sup>  
~~65~~ The method of claim <sup>9</sup>~~64~~ wherein the plasma gas penetrates the antihalation composition coating layer.

#### REMARKS

The Abstract has been amended as requested in the Office Action. Non-elected claims 36-42 and 47-53 have been cancelled without prejudice. Solely to address formality-type matters raised under Section 112, second paragraph (antecedent basis), claims 43, 44, 54 and 55 have been amended. New dependent claims 58-65 have been added. No new matter has been added by virtue of the amendments and new claims. For instance, support for the new claims appears e.g. at page 21, line 14 through page 23, line 5.

Applicants also request that the documents cited in the Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement filed February 5, 2002 be considered and made of record. Enclosed is a copy of that previously filed Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement.

Applicants hereby affirm the election to the Restriction Requirement as noted in the Office Action.

It is believed the Abstract submitted herewith obviates the objection to the prior Abstract.

Claims 43-46 and 54-57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph for antecedent basis (a formality issue).

While Applicants consider the claims as presented are acceptable in all respects including formalities matters, the claims also have been amended to provide further antecedent basis.

In view thereof, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are requested.

Claims 54 and 55 were rejected under the doctrine of obviousness-type double-patenting over claim 25 of U.S. Patent 6,165,697.

Claims 54, 56 and 57 were rejected under the doctrine of obviousness-type double-patenting over claims 1, 7 and 10 of U.S. Patent 5,851,738.

Claims 43-46 were rejected under the doctrine of obviousness-type double-patenting over claims 1, 6 and 12 of U.S. Patent 5,851,730.

For the sake of brevity, the three rejections are addressed in combination.

To expedite prosecution, Applicants submit herewith appropriate Terminal Disclaimers to obviate the rejections. It is thus believed the rejections are properly withdrawn.

It is believed the application in condition for immediate allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

*P*

Thackeray et al.  
U.S.S.N. 09/924,045  
Page 5

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Peter F. Corless', with a stylized, cursive script.

Peter F. Corless (Reg. 33,860)  
EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP  
*Dike, Bronstein, Roberts & Cushman IP Group*  
P.O. Box 9169  
Boston, MA 02209  
(617) 439-4444

*B*

**MARKED VERSION TO SHOW CHANGES**

43. (amended) A coated substrate comprising:  
a substrate having thereon:  
a coating layer of an antireflective composition, the antireflective composition comprising a crosslinker and an anthracene material; and  
a coating layer of a photoresist composition over the antireflective composition coating layer.

44. (amended) The substrate of claim 43 wherein the antireflective composition coating layer is crosslinked.

54. (amended) A method for forming a relief image on a substrate comprising:  
applying on the substrate a layer of an antihalation composition comprising an anthracene material;  
applying over the anthracene composition coating layer a photoresist composition.

55. (amended) The method of claim 54 wherein the antihalation composition coating layer is crosslinked prior to applying the photoresist composition.

B